Vol. IX, No. 33 HUMAN EVENTS August 13, 1952

AN EDUCATION FOR IKE — AND OTHERS

By BRENT BOZELL

ASKED what we should do about Korea, Dwight Eisenhower said he didn't know. This was the "Honest Ike" of Abilene, and lots of people commended him for his candor. But a major difference between Ike and the rest of us is that we are not asking to be elected to the Presidency.

True, no important political leader to date has persuasively diagnosed the Korean blunder. Neither political party has indicated an understanding of what the Soviet Union is about. Neither party platform advocates plausible escape from the devilish trap in which the Kremlin master-plotters ensnared us two years ago. But Ike would lead a "crusade". So a "me-too" on ignorance won't do. He must be educated.

Unfortunately, the General is likely to turn for his education to the wrong people — specifically, to the leaders of his own political party. For Republicans, no less than Democrats, have failed to identify the real Soviet motives in engineering the Korean war. GOP leaders have peculiar acumen in spotting the symptoms of disaster. But since they haven't diagnosed the malady, they aren't likely to come up with the cure.

The GOP "party line" is familiar enough: "The Democrats are to blame for our plight in Korea because the Administration announced to the world during the months preceding June, 1950, that we would not defend South Korea, and thereby they 'invited' the Communist attack."

The chronology seems to bear out the charge. Dean Acheson told the National Press Club in January, 1950, that Korea was not a part of the line the United States would defend. Senator Connolly advised the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in May that Korea was not essential to our defense. And in June, anticipating an easy kill, Soviet Russia unleashed her Hessians against the Republic of South Korea.

Assuming the Kremlin did *not* want America to intervene in Korea, the indictment of the Administration is as indestructible as Euclid's geometry.

But don't jump too fast, Ike. Mistaken premises beget mistaken conclusions. If it's true that Russia "blundered" into the Korean war — enticed by our State Department's protestation of indifference — then it is not unreasonable to conclude that Russia is presently unhappy with the Korean situation, that she would be done with this unpleasant business even as we would be done with it. And the current truce negotiations are the logical recourse for two warring nations, both anxious to end the conflict, both determined

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to exact the dearest price. Thus, the GOP's slick argument gives full sanction to the Administration's present policy of negotiation and compromise.

Curiously, the devotees of this theory — that Russia made a "mistake" — simply refuse to take the enemy at his word. If credence is given the Communists' own description of their grand strategy, Russia must be utterly delighted with the present impasse in Korea; and Politburo members probably danced in their pajamas two years ago when they learned that an American President had committed his country to a war on the Asia mainland. The contrary presumption, indeed, took root in the western world: the United States had "won a round" by intervening in Korea. That this mammoth hoax should still persist is a monument either to the wizardry of Soviet propaganda, or to the impoverishment of American statesmanship.

THE SUPREME arrogance of Marxist determinism led Communist writers from the beginning to make their plans an "open book" for the world to read. This "open book" (reproduced in W. H. Chamberlin's *Blueprint for World Conquest*) is the primer for everyman's political education. But watch out, Ike: only a very few of those who read the book seem able to take the dialecticians seriously.

Communism's prophets have taken pains to tell us that the United States will fall under Soviet hegemony only when our capitalistic system has disappeared. Most Americans have blandly assumed that as long as the economic system is under our control it will remain what it is as long as we want it to; an assumption that is wholly acceptable to the Kremlin. For, while we take comfort in the thought that our internal economy can't be ruined from the outside, the Soviet strategists have set out to do just that.

At West Point, it is said, a future general is taught, as a rule of thumb, to put himself in the shoes of the opposing commander before a battle, and decide what he would do if he were his opposite number. Suppose, Ike, that at the end of the last war you sat in on a Politburo meeting — a meeting specially called to consider ways and means of bringing about the downfall of Capitalism in the United States. Since you'd studied basic economics, you would probably concur in the four points your brethren were making:

That a transfer of the tools of production from private hands to the Government (such as takes place in wartime), if sustained over a long period of time, will deal a fatal blow to free enterprise in the U.S.;

That a long-term allocation of America's productive potential to the manufacture of armaments will reduce the nation's standard of living, and thus sow discontent;

That Government regulation of prices and wages will result in the abandonment of the capitalistic price system;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That prolonged Government spending beyond revenue intake will create fierce inflationary pressures with consequent societal dislocations; or, in the alternative, if tax rates are raised to meet expenditures, a *pro tanto* transfer of the tools of production from private citizens to the Government will occur.

And the solution to meet all four specifications for Capitalism's destruction? Why, commit the United States to a wartime economy, without involving the USSR. . . . It was an ambitious project, needing an assist from American diplomacy, which Moscow somehow got. The Kremlin masters busied themselves laying bait 'round the world.

KOREA IS THE payoff. Whether the Russians expected it to turn out so is beside the point. Russian strategy did not need to be geared inflexibly to the success of any single venture. The Communist chessboard encompasses the whole world. The lures set in Greece and China had been shunned by the United States, and perhaps North Korea's aggression would likewise fail to provoke us to armed retaliation. But somewhere, sooner or later, the bait would be snapped up. When President Truman committed the American Army to battle Asiatic Communism at a point 7,000 miles from its home base — a "police action", not a war against the Soviet Union — the bold and brilliant scheme for world conquest was no longer a fanciful dream. The plan had worked.

Meanwhile, American diplomats are still scratching their heads at the Russian "blunder" of walking out of the Security Council in June, 1950, thus losing their chance to block UN military action in Korea.

We're assuming (although Europe isn't the subject of today's lesson) that America's commitment to NATO is largely traceable to Korea — that the Soviets expected their Korean attack to provoke a flimsy, world-wide mobilization of the sort that has actually occurred.

In point of time, the connection between Korea and NATO is unmistakable. Serious financing of Europe's defenses did not begin till August, 1950. Why just then? Whatever knowledge we possessed *after* the Korean fighting began, with regard to Russia's aggressive intentions in Europe, we possessed *before* Korea. Since Korea, the Russians have undertaken no specific act in Europe to arouse suspicions. The notion which prevailed in the summer of 1950 (and which still persists) was, "the Russians are setting a decoy in Asia to divert our attention from Europe — the real Soviet objective." Not to be fooled by the Kremlin, our State Department quickly moved to effectuate Soviet designs. The plain implication of the record is that America fell "hook, line and sinker" for an enormous Soviet ruse, and is currently helping the Kremlin to haul in the line.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THAT'S THE STORY, Ike. The Communists have provoked America into fostering global semi-mobilization, without the power or the purpose of harming the Soviet Union. Their objective of destroying the economic system they hate and fear is all the more attainable. Their success — unmeasurable. No one dares to predict when we shall be able to return to a free enterprise economy.

The enormity of Soviet success in Korea is now becoming apparent. The returns are incomplete, but let's look at the score-board:

On June 28, 1950, our annual federal tax bill was in the neighborhood of 44 billion dollars. Federal taxes for fiscal 1953 are estimated by the President at 75 billions. This means, using private ownership of the tools of production as a measure of free enterprise, that in the course of three years, the U.S. will have become, relatively, 70% less capitalistic than it was at the outbreak of the Korean war.

On June 28, 1950, 20% of our national product was devoted to national defense (including ECA). Under the President's current budget, nearly 30% of our national product will be earmarked for defense. This means that the portion of their produce which Americans aren't permitted to consume will be 50% greater than the comparable allotment to armaments at the outbreak of the Korean war.

On June 28, 1950, our economy operated under a free price system. Today we seem to be permanently committed to price and wage controls.

On June 28, 1950, the federal budget was running a surplus of 2½ billions. The current budget envisions a deficit of 10 billions. Other inflationary factors have contributed to reduce the dollar's value since the outbreak of the Korean war.

Thus, what we can guess to have been the Kremlin's four specifications for the destruction of U.S. Capitalism have been met to the letter. And the Soviet Union is still not at war.

Our present policy envisions no termination point. What plans have we, for example, for the military forces we're now building if, thirty years from now, with our freedom evanescing, the threat of a Soviet attack is neither more nor less imminent than it is today?

To be sure, we need a "crusade". We need leadership which understands that ruin inheres in the kind of war we're fighting. We need, as President, one who will advocate getting out of Korea, or will recommend prosecuting that war with every resource at our command, even if it means coming to grips with the Soviet Union. It's plain enough that either we maintain free enterprise with reasonable expenditures for continental defense, or we build a powerful military establishment with the purpose of *using* it, as soon as it is ready, to destroy the military power of Communism. Any third course refuses to make sense.

MR. BRENT BOZELL is a student at Yale Law School.

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. IX, No. 33 Wednesday, August 13, 1952 Washington, D. C.

MINN. LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY RECEIVED AUG 20 1952

Friends of Adlai: The press generally has reported that Candidate Stevenson is "touchy" on one point (with the implication it is the only point) — his connection with Alger Hiss.

In 1949, Stevenson gave a favorable character deposition which went into the record in the famous trial of Hiss. Since his entrance into the presidential arena, Stevenson has sought to minimize both the deposition and his relations in former years with the man now serving sentence for perjury in connection with his traitorous services to Soviet Russia.

Just now in Washington animated discussions are going on over the question — will the Eisenhower forces effectively press this matter to the detriment of the Stevenson campaign?

So far, one aspect of the Stevenson testimony for Hiss has not received attention. The point is made here by those who closely watched the famous trial, that Stevenson did not have to give that much discussed deposition for Hiss. He was not subpoenaed, legally forced to appear and testify. Adlai voluntarily gave his deposition.

Friends of Stevenson have raised the objection that Stevenson gave the deposition voluntarily probably because he would have been subpoenaed if he didn't. That does not necessarily follow. It is recalled that Hiss' friends sought to get two prominent New Dealers to testify for Hiss — Judge Jerome Frank, of the U.S. Court of Appeals, and Mr. Gardner Jackson, both former colleagues of Hiss when the latter served in the Department of Agriculture. Both reportedly refused. They were not subpoenaed. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that Stevenson could have, especially in view of his prominence as Governor of Illinois, declined to testify without fear of being subpoenaed. It was to his political interest to refuse. The growing public curiosity about this matter leads to the following question: Was Stevenson a much closer friend of the now imprisoned traitor than he will admit?

Adlai, therefore, remains a "set up" for the marksmanship of the Eisenhower campaigners. Yet when Gov. McKeldin of Maryland, a backer of the General, took advantage of this easy target, he was severely criticized by the *Washington Post*, which supports Ike. The public has been frequently reminded that Vice Presidential Candidate Nixon made a name for himself for his role in the exposure of Hiss. However, Washington observers recall that Nixon, once he became a Senator, had precious little to say on the exposure of subversives.

It is also recalled that once before the Republicans missed the boat on this issue. When the exposure of Hiss and other subversives was at its height in September, 1948, as the Dewey campaign for the Presidency was starting, the GOP candidate reportedly urged members of the House Un-American Activities Committee to suspend the investigations, and conspicuously failed to exploit this issue during the campaign. Will the GOP again fumble this kind of an opportunity?

More Friends of Adlai: While Stevenson has proved very artful in presenting himself as a "middle of the roader", he has not been able to conceal the pedigree of his chief campaign adviser, Mr. Wilson Wyatt. The latter is a former president of the Americans for Democratic Action. The ADA, a power in the Democratic Party, was thoroughly exposed as a "socialist front" by John T. Flynn in his book,

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Road Ahead. Nothing that Wyatt has done or said since the days when he was president of the organization indicates that he has changed his attitude. Moreover, close to Wyatt in his direction of the campaign is Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., a very active leader of the ADA.

Mr. Stephen Mitchell, just named as new Chairman of the Democratic National Committee to succeed Frank McKinney, may or may not be a "middle of the roader". But it is interesting to note the political complexion of some of his sponsors. Mitchell, until his appointment as National Chairman, had been working as counsel to the Chelf Committee, investigating the Department of Justice. The Washington *Daily News* (August 9) reported how Mitchell got that job: "He was proposed by Representative Emmanuel Celler . . . on the suggestion of Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas." Celler might charitably be described as "a little left-of-center"; but Douglas must be classified flatly as a "left-winger", not only for his Court decisions, but also for his public speeches.

In short, there is every prospect that Stevenson, if elected, will be surrounded by the same high-level, leftist intellectual advisers as was Harry Truman and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Third Parties: Several hundred former supporters of Taft and MacArthur held a meeting in Chicago last week to discuss the possibility of a third party or political action independent of the two major parties. A majority opposed formation of a third party, reportedly (1) because of the difficulty or impossibility of getting a third ticket on the ballot at this late date, and (2) because they did not wish to detract conservative strength from conservatives running for Congress on the Republican ticket. Many members wished to organize an effort to help elect a conservative Congress. At the end of this gathering, another meeting was held at which plans for a third party were laid.

As for the Southern independent movement, skillful work by the Administration at the Convention seems to have forestalled such political action this year. The proposal of Governor James F. Byrnes at the South Carolina Democratic Convention last week to put Stevenson and Sparkman on the State's ballots is significant. It is reported, however, that "regular" Democratic sentiment is tepid in Dixie. Some observers wonder if there will not arise some independent action if both Ike and Adlai start a furious bidding match for the Northern negro vote.

In that case, it is suggested, State Democratic committees could release their state presidential electors from obligation to vote for Stevenson. Since these electors are usually part of the state Democratic organizations, such a move would be tantamount to a Southern revolt. However, it is admitted that it's a big order to get all or most of the Southern states to work together on such a matter.

Arnall: Ellis Arnall, Director of Price Stabilization, has been giving forth so many sounds of acute discomfort that his early resignation is expected. Certainly, the objective situation hardly pleased him. The overall cost of living on June 15 (latest available figures) hit a new peak, about 90% over World War II levels. Since June, many items of food have been climbing. No wonder Arnall predicted another "round of inflation".

Naturally, the commissar blames Congress, the steel firms, indeed everyone save labor and the Administration which hired him. He's especially mad at Congress because that body cut appropriations for the OPS, a legislative act which caused Arnall to reduce his staff of bureaucrats by one-half. Among those who are familiar with the necessity for proper care and feeding of bureaucrats, this earned the term of "the unkindest cut of all".

Arnall — like Eric Johnston and Michael di Salle — probably calculated that it was a case of heads-I-win-tails-you-lose for price administrator. If prices continued upward, he would get the blame for inflation; and if they go down, he would bear the responsibility for a recession. Meanwhile, a commissar

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with his bureaucracy cut in half loses face among other aspiring commissars. So, why not resign before his prestige is entirely ruined?

Fortuitious Emergencies: Just as the presidential campaign begins, the hog comes up with — of all things — vesicular exanthema. This is a relatively new swine disease, curable only by slaughter. The Government promptly offers to compensate the chagrined farmer-voter for this loss. This opportunity to demonstrate its love for the agriculturalist comes at a time when the Government is readying its check-book for the drought-stricken farmers in eleven states.

The Government has a big heart, one that feels for every voter in the country. Key officials of the Defense Production Administration are not satisfied with the progress of industry's "defense" expansion — in urban areas, which also vote — and are pleading for authority to build and operate Government-owned plants. Wherever the Government fathers some "project", an island of prosperity arises, and it is certainly good politics to breed more of them.

In 1936, the formula for running successful presidential campaigns was invented. It has not failed the party in power in any of the succeeding general elections. Why should it be abandoned this time? There will be emergencies enough this summer and fall to justify extreme liberality with the taxpayers' money. We will have prosperity, come hell, high water or inflation.

Meanwhile, the cost of living is going up. Some blame it on the anticipated shortage of farm products. Others point to the rise in steel prices permitted by OPS, following the rise in wages authorized by WSB. Regardless of cause, something must be done to soothe the housewife, disgruntled with the cost-of-living. There is talk of reconvening Congress for the purpose of restoring vigor to the emaciated price control board. Even if this is not done, the Government can use the H.C.L. to direct the anger of the aforesaid housewife (who also votes) against the wicked Republicans who allegedly caused this price rise by curtailing controls.

James Madison called it "the old trick of turning every contingency into a resource of accumulating force in government". It still works.

With Congress Away: "While Congress is away, the State Department is working here, there and everywhere, all over the globe, to get us deeper into collectivist world government and to let the Chinese Communists in at the back door", says Senator Jenner in a statement released to the press.

Specifically, Jenner points to Acheson's ANZUS conference in Hawaii last week and brings out the fact that the Secretary took with him Dr. Philip Jessup, author of the "infamous" China White Paper, and former Chairman of the Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations. That body, Jenner reminds us, was described by the McCarran Internal Security Committee as a "cover shop" for "Soviet Military Intelligence". Jenner says Jessup "showed such a well-documented affinity for Communist causes that the Democratic-controlled Foreign Relations Committee refused to approve his designation to UN." To take Jessup along to work on the Pacific pact, said Jenner, "is deliberately to defy the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Congress itself".

Mr. Jenner also noted that the Hawaii branch of the Institute of Pacific Relations issued a report timed for the ANZUS conference last week which included a recommendation that Australia drop its "white supremacy policy". Is FEPC on the way to become global policy?

The Indiana Senator also charges that Japan has been permitted to sign an agreement, professedly to limit Japanese trade with the Communists; but actually this "expands it, and Japan starts on the first step of the path laid down in the reparations clauses of the Japanese peace treaty, by which she is to equip the hordes of Red China for the next war".

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the above statement — it is important to note — Jenner obviously seeks to warn the State Department of the importance of Congress, and at the same time seeks to call the attention of the public to the vital role Congress must play — while the presidential candidates engage in their forensics. "Congress", he emphasizes,, "is the Watch Tower of the Nation". He warns that unless members of Congress "act to stop the Administration's continuous drive to deeper involvement in a collectivist one-world, our defense will be so completely strangled that no Administration, Republican or Democratic, can set it free".

Thus, by implication, he seems to underline the importance of the election of the right sort of Congress, seems to argue that, unless there is a good Congress acting to block dubious foreign moves of the Executive, there looms danger to the Republic, no matter who is elected President.

Revisionism: More revision of the official propaganda about our entrance into World War II appears in an Associated Press dispatch (August 10) from Tokyo, which has aroused much discussion in the Capital.

"The real war criminal was Roosevelt, and I wish to indict him at a divine court", states Chuchi Ohashi, who was the No. 2 man in the Japanese foreign office in the first part of 1941, writing in the Japanese magazine *Hanoshi.* Ohashi accuses Roosevelt of "deceiving and provoking Japan into attacking Pearl Harbor so he could mobilize America for the war he wanted".

The writer, says the A.P., strongly supports his former chief, the late Japanese foreign minister Yosuke Matsuoka, who died in 1946 while on trial as a war criminal. Ohashi said Matsuoka had planned to fly to Washington for talks with Roosevelt in an effort to stop the Japanese invasion of China, "but Roosevelt was more canny than Matsuoka and succeeded in getting Prime Minister Fumimaro Konoye and the military to squeeze Matsuoka out of the cabinet." Ohashi asserts that his chief wanted to arbitrate the European war in company with the U.S., "but Roosevelt wanted to fight Germany and Japan at any cost."

The A.P. adds a note in which the press association asserts that Matsuoka, on his famous "peace mission" to Europe in the spring of 1941, told Hitler he favored a surprise attack on the U.S. The A.P. also says that Matsuoka on this mission made a full military alliance with the German-Italian Axis.

We asked Dr. Chas. C. Tansill, professor of history at Georgetown University to comment on the A.P. story for readers of HUMAN EVENTS. (Dr. Tansill is author of the book, *Back Door to War,* recently published by Henry Regnery Company.) Tansill says Ohashi is correct in saying that Matsuoka had sincerely worked for peace between the U.S. and Japan; that the A.P. is correct in saying that the Japanese Foreign Minister made a military alliance with the Axis on his peace mission of 1941; and that the State Department's own published book of documents on Nazi-Soviet relations of 1939-41 contains no record of any suggestion by Matsuoka to Hitler that a surprise attack should be launched against the U.S.

On the contrary, says Dr. Tansill, Matsuoka's interview with Hitler (and Ribbentrop) was marked by complete agreement between the three that every effort should be made to keep the U.S. out of the war. As a matter of fact, Tansill remarks, the Japanese Foreign Minister on a number of other occasions tried to reach a peace agreement with Franklin D. Roosevelt. In 1940, Matsuoka persuaded two members of the Catholic Maryknoll order to convey peace terms to F.D.R., including an offer by Japan to remove all Japanese troops from China. But the President failed to act on the offer.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED